Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 1–5 (2013) Printed 7 January 2014 (MN LATEX style file v2.2)

Determination of the masses of the components of the HDE 226868/Cyg X-1 binary system

J. Ziółkowski ⋆
N. Copernicus Astronomical Center, ul. Bartycka 18, 00-716 Warsaw, Poland

arXiv:1401.1035v1 [astro-ph.SR] 6 Jan 2014

Accepted 0000 December 00. Received 0000 December 00; in original form 0000 December 00

ABSTRACT

Recent determination of the distance to HDE 226868/Cyg X-1 binary system (Reid et al., 2011) and more precise determination of the effective temperature of HDE 226868 (Caballero-Nieves et al., 2009) permit a more accurate estimate of the masses of both components. Using up to date evolutionary models, I obtain a mass range of between 25 to 35 $M_\odot$ for the mass of the supergiant and between 13 to 23 $M_\odot$ for the mass of the black hole. Accepting more liberal estimates of uncertainties in both the distance and the effective temperature, one may extend these ranges to 21 to 35 $M_\odot$ and 10 to 23 $M_\odot$ for both masses, respectively. The most likely values within these ranges are, respectively, 27 $M_\odot$ and 16 $M_\odot$. The obtained mass of black hole agrees with the value 15 ± 1 $M_\odot$ suggested by Orosz et al. (2011). However, the value suggested by them for the mass of the supergiant of 19 ± 2 $M_\odot$ should not be used as such a star violates the mass-luminosity relation for the the massive core hydrogen burning stars. This consideration was not incorporated into the iterative process of Orosz et al.

To resolve this violation I consider the possibility that the hydrogen content of HDE 222268 might be lowered as a result of the mass transfer and the induced fast rotation of the mass gainer. I analyzed the evolutionary effects of such situation and found that, while important, they do not invalidate the conclusions listed above. If, as a result of the rotation induced mixing, the present hydrogen content of HDE 226868 is equal about 0.6 (as suggested by some observational data), then its present mass may be somewhat lower: ∼ 24 $M_\odot$ rather than ∼ 27 $M_\odot$.

Key words: binaries: general – stars: evolution – stars: individual: Cyg X-1 – stars: massive – X-rays: binaries.

1 INTRODUCTION

Cyg X-1 was the first recognized black hole (Bolton 1972) but the masses of the binary components are still a subject of controversy. The long history of their determinations prior to 2005 is given by Ziolkowski (2005). After 2005, two major observational improvements, crucial for mass determination, took place. First, Caballero-Nieves et al. (2009, hereafter C-N+09) through careful stellar atmosphere modeling obtained more precise estimate of the effective temperature of supergiant HDE 226868, which is a binary companion of Cyg X-1. Second, Reid et al. (2011, hereafter R+11) estimated (through a radio parallax) the distance to the binary system HDE 226868/Cyg X-1. Orosz et al. (2011, hereafter O+11) used this distance to estimate the parameters of the binary system. They have done a very precise job, using 8 free parameters and fitting almost 600 observables: 3 UBV light curves (20 points each) and radial velocity curve (529 points). The values of the parameters were determined through an iterative scheme. The additional free parameter was the effective temperature of the supergiant. This parameter, however, was not iterated with the others, but was adjusted separately (the preferred value was found to be T_e = 31 000 K). Allowing for non-synchronous rotation of the supergiant and slightly eccentric orbit, O+11 were able to obtain impressively good fits of all three light curves and of the radial velocity curve. From their iterative process, they got $i = 27.06 \pm 0.76^o$ for the binary orbit inclination and $M_{opt} = 19.16 \pm 1.90$ $M_\odot$ and $M_X = 14.81 \pm 0.98$ $M_\odot$ for the masses of both components. The formal errors are impressively low. However, the solution has a flaw: the mass of the optical component is inconsistent with its calculated luminosity ($\log L/L_\odot$ = 5.352). The mass and the luminosity of massive core hydrogen burning stars are not independent parameters, as I will demonstrate in this paper. I will also discuss the consequences of this fact.

2 THE EVOLUTIONARY CALCULATIONS FOR HDE 226868

I calculated new evolutionary models for the supergiant HDE 226868, making use of a new more precise estimate of its effective temperature (C-N+09) and of the just determined distance to

⋆ E-mail: jz@camk.edu.pl

© 2013 RAS



Figure 1. The mass-luminosity relation (based on the evolutionary models) for massive core hydrogen burning stars at effective temperature T_e = 31 000 K. The relation is given for two values of the multiplying factor f_{SW} applied to HPT formula. The dotted horizontal line corresponds to the luminosity favored by O+11 solution. The values of the masses corresponding to the crossings of this line with $M-L$ relations are also shown (in solar units). Note that the value of the optical component mass suggested by O+11 (19.2 $M_\odot$) lies out of the frame of the picture.

the binary system (R+11). The evolutionary tracks were computed for core hydrogen-burning phase of stars with initial masses in the range 25–40 $M_\odot$. The Warsaw evolutionary code described by Ziolkowski (2005) was used. The standard Population I chemical composition of X=0.7 and Z=0.02 was adopted as the initial chemical composition.

The calculations were carried out under the assumption that the evolution starts from homogeneous configurations (i.e. the evolutionary clock was reset at the end of the mass transfer and the evolution started anew). Ziolkowski (2005) gave the arguments indicating that this is a good approximation. To calculate the stellar wind mass loss, I applied the formula derived by Hurley, Pols & Tout (2000, hereafter HPT), based on parametrization of Nieuwenhuijzen & de Jager (1990). As in earlier papers, I introduced the multiplicative factor f_{SW} applied to the HPT formula. The evolutionary calculations indicate, that to account for the evolutionary state of HDE 226868, with the present day observational data, one has to use the value of f_{SW} in the range 2 to 5 (the values in Tab. 1 cover the range of 2 to 8, but I do not consider the the case with f_{SW} = 8 as a realistic model – see the further discussion).

2.1 The mass-luminosity relation for massive core hydrogen burning stars

This relation, based on our evolutionary models, for the value of the effective temperature T_e = 31 000 K (i.e. the value adopted by O+11) is shown in Fig. 1. As one can see, this relation is quite tight and the dependence on the uncertain parameter f_{SW} is weak. Please, note that the value of the supergiant mass suggested by O+11 (19.2 $M_\odot$) for their value of its luminosity (log $L/L_\odot$ = 5.352) lies out of the frame of the picture.

2.2 The evolutionary tracks in the Hertzsprung-Russell (HR) diagram

The observational constraints given by C-N+09 for the effective temperature of HDE 226868 and by R+11 for the distance to the binary system produce an error box in the HR diagram, that is shown as a parallelogram in Fig. 2. The "best" observational solution lies in the center of this parallelogram. The solution advocated by O+11 is shown as a green cross. The procedure of obtaining the different evolutionary models of HDE 226868 was the following one. For each pair of the chosen values of T_e and d (corresponding e.g. to the center or to a corner of the error box) a corresponding position (i.e. a pair of the values of T_e and L) was calculated. Then an evolutionary track passing through that position was calculated. The value of f_{SW} was adjusted so as to obtain a stellar wind strength at this position consistent within 10 % with the observed value ($\dot{M} = -2.6\times10^{-6}$ $M_\odot$/yr, Gies et al. 2003).

The observational estimate of the stellar wind mass flux requires a brief comment. Stellar wind from HDE 226868 is rather complicated (detailed modeling was done by Gies et al. 2008). It is composed of a narrow stream of focused wind along the axis joining both components and a roughly isotropic wind from the hemisphere which is in the X-ray shadow (the side which is not illuminated by the X-ray from the vicinity of black hole). The first component determines, in first approximation, the amount of the accreted matter and so also the X-ray luminosity. The second one determines the total mass loss from the supergiant. From the point of view of comparing evolutionary models with the observations, the second component is relevant. Paper of Gies et al. (2008) does not give any quantitative estimate. Earlier paper (Gies et al. 2003) gave $\dot{M} = -2.6\times10^{-6}$ $M_\odot$/yr for the low/hard state and $\dot{M} = -2.0\times10^{-6}$ $M_\odot$/yr for the high/soft state. Cyg X-1 spends most of the time in the low/hard state although this time fraction decreased recently from ~ 90 % to ~ 66 % (Wilms et al. 2006). Moreover, Zdziarski et al. (2011) found that the average X-ray luminosity did not change meaningfully during the hard states of recent ~ 15 years, which might imply that also the average total mass loss was constant. Taking all this into account, I decided to take $\dot{M} = -2.6\times10^{-6}$ $M_\odot$/yr as the evolutionary parameter describing the present state of HDE 226868.

The procedure described at the beginning of this (2.2) section produced several possible evolutionary models of HDE 226868 that are listed in Tab. 1. The corresponding evolutionary tracks in the H-R diagram are shown in Fig. 2. As one may see, all tracks predict, with a wide margin, that HDE 226868 is in core hydrogen burning phase. Indeed, the central hydrogen content for models in Tab. 1 is in the range 0.13 to 0.17. This indicates that the star is in slow, nuclear phase of its evolution and is consistent with the observed constancy of the orbital period of the system (Gies & Bolton 1982).

As may be seen from Tab. 1 and Fig. 2, assuming wide margins for uncertainty of both T_e and d, one gets the mass of HDE 226868 in the range 20.7 to 35.4 $M_\odot$. However, I believe that the value of T_e equal 25 500 K is rather too low for HDE 226868. Also, the value f_{SW} = 8, required to get a fit for this temperature, seems to be excessively high. Therefore, I would rather discard the third line in Tab. 1 and state that, on evolutionary ground, the mass of HDE 226868 is probably in the range 25 to 35 $M_\odot$.

3 THE MASS OF THE BLACK HOLE COMPONENT

Once the evolutionary model of the supergiant component is selected from Tab. 1, we can use two equations discussed by Ziolkowski (2005). One of these equations makes use of the mass function,

$$f(M_X) = M_{opt}\sin^3 i/[q(1+q)^2]. \quad (1)$$

Table 1. Present mass of the optical component for the different assumed values of its effective temperature and of the distance to the binary system. The most likely model is typed in boldface (it corresponds to the effective temperature estimate of C-N+09 and distance estimate of R+11.

d [kpc]	T_e [10^3 K]	log$L$ [$L_\odot$]	M_{opt} [$M_\odot$]	f_{SW}	M_0 [$M_\odot$]
1.86	**28.0**	**5.309**	**27.2**	**3.6**	**33**
1.98	30.5	5.513	35.4	1.76	40
1.75	25.5	5.094	20.7	8	29
1.75	28.0	5.257	25.5	4.9	32.5
1.86	31.0	5.352	29.4	4	36

NOTES:

f_{SW} denotes the multiplying factor applied to HPT formula; M_0 denotes the initial (ZAMS) mass of the optical component for a given evolutionary track; other symbols have their usual meanings



Figure 2. The evolutionary tracks in the H-R diagram. The tracks are labeled with the initial mass of the star (in solar units). The values of the multiplying factor f_{SW} applied to HPT formula were adjusted individually for each track (see Table 1), so as to obtain agreement with the observed value of the present strength of stellar wind from HDE 226868. The tracks were meant to reproduce the observed values of the present luminosity and effective temperature of HDE 226868 according to the different solutions listed in Table 1. The parallelogram describe the observational error box using effective temperature estimates of C-N+09 and distance estimates of R+11 (the central values of these estimates are marked by the blue cross). The green cross corresponds to O+11 solution.

where $q = M_{opt}/M_X$ is the ratio of the masses of the components and i is the inclination of the orbit. The other relates the radius of the star to the size of the orbit,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{opt} &= R_{RL} \times f_{RL} = \\ &= f_{RL}(0.38 + 0.2 \log\ q)A = \\ &= f_{RL}(0.38 + 0.2 \log\ q)a_1(1+q), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where R_{RL} is the radius of the Roche lobe around HDE 226868, f_{RL} is the fill-out factor ($f_{RL} = R_{opt}/R_{RL}$), A is the orbital separation of the binary components and a_1 is the radius of the orbit of HDE 226868 around the mass center of the system.

Measurements of the radial velocities of the optical component give us $f(M_x) = 0.251$ $M_\odot$ and $a_1 \sin i = 8.36$ $R_\odot$ (Gies et al. in 2003). Inserting these observational data, eqs. (1)−(2) can be written as:

$$M_{opt}\sin^3 i/[q(1+q)^2] = 0.251, \quad (3)$$

$$R_{opt} = f_{RL}(0.38 + 0.2 \log\ q)(1+q) \times 8.36/\sin i. \quad (4)$$

Now, the procedure of constructing the model of the binary system is the following one.

(1) First, we select an evolutionary model of HDE 226868 from Tab. 1.

(2) Second, we select the value of the coefficient f_{RL}.

(3) Once the value of f_{RL} is assumed, we can solve the the eqs. (3)−(4) for i and q and then get also the mass of the compact component M_X.

We do not have large freedom in selecting the value of f_{RL}. Earlier observations and analysis (Gies & Bolton 1986a,b; C-N+09; O+11) indicate that it has to be larger than 0.9 and, most likely, not smaller than 0.95. Similarly, not all resulting values of the inclination i are acceptable. The same observations and analysis indicate that it cannot be substantially different from about 30° (O+11 got $i \sim 27°$).

Models of the binary system, obtained by taking evolutionary supergiant models from Tab.1 and selecting the value of f_{RL} in the range 0.95 - 1 are listed in Tab. 2.

The last two lines of this table (corresponding to the solution proposed by O+11) cannot describe realistic models, since they require too small value of f_{RL} (let us note that parameters suggested by O+11 imply $f_{RL} \approx 0.935$, but they use much smaller value for the mass of the optical component). Taken at face value, Tab. 2 imply the mass of the black hole in the range 10 to 23 $M_\odot$. However, if one remembers what was said about the realistic supergiant models (section 2.2) and if one requires additionally that f_{RL} is $\geqslant 0.95$, then one gets the range 13 - 23 $M_\odot$. I consider this as the probable range for the mass of the black hole in the system.

The most likely model is perhaps the one typed in boldface (second line in Tab. 2). It corresponds to the Roche lobe filling factor $f_{RL} \sim 0.965$ and the inclination $i \sim 30°$. I may add that, if one looks for the model with mass ratio q equal 2.78 (as implied by an emission lines component discussed by Gies et al. 2003), then (assuming still $M_{opt} = 27.2$ $M_\odot$) the required inclination is $i \sim 46°$ (rather too high) and the required value of the Roche lobe filling factor $f_{RL} \sim 0.92$ (rather too small).

4 THE EFFECTS OF POSSIBLE RAPID ROTATION OF THE MASS GAINER AT THE END OF THE MASS TRANSFER

According to the analysis by C-N+09, the fit of the optical spectrum of HDE 226868 is better for the model atmospheres with the hydrogen content X equal about 0.55 than for the solar abundances. This is not a precise determination (as indicated by the authors) but it suggests that HDE 226868 may have, at present, a decreased hydrogen content. The reasons for such hydrogen depletion are not difficult to find. In the course of its binary evolution, the system probably underwent a major mass transfer, during which HDE 226868 was a mass gainer. Accretion could spin up the star to very fast rotation. The rotation could, in turn, induce large scale mixing which might even homogenize the star. In this way, both the internal layers which were partially hydrogen depleted due to earlier evolution of the mass gainer and the newly dumped layers which were partially

Table 2. Parameters of the selected evolutionary models of the binary system HDE 226868/Cyg X-1. The most likely model is the one typed in boldface (it corresponds to the mass of the optical component M_{opt} equal 27 $M_\odot$, the Roche lobe filling factor f_{RL} equal 0.965 and the inclination i equal 30^o).

d [kpc]	T_e [10^3 K]	log$L$ [$L_\odot$]	M_{opt} [$M_\odot$]	f_{RL}	i [^{o}]	M_x [$M_\odot$]
1.86	**28.0**	**5.309**	**27.2**	0.95	34.4	13.1
				0.965	**29.3**	**15.8**
				0.98	25.0	19.3
1.98	30.5	5.513	35.4	0.92	33.8	15.6
				0.95	24.5	22.9
1.75	25.5	5.094	20.7	0.98	38.3	10.0
				1.00	31.0	12.7
1.75	28.0	5.257	25.5	0.91	37.0	11.7
				0.93	29.5	15.1
				0.95	23.7	20.0
1.86	31.0	5.352	29.4	0.80	31.9	14.9
				0.83	21.8	24.1

NOTES:

f_{RL} denotes the Roche lobe fill-out factor; i denotes the inclination of the binary orbit; other symbols have their usual meanings

Table 3. Present masses of the optical component for the models with lowered hydrogen content.The corresponding evolutionary tracks are shown in Fig. 3

X_0	M_{opt}/$M_\odot$ (CN+09)	acceptable?	M_{opt}/$M_\odot$ (O+11)	acceptable?
0.70	27.2	Y	29.4	Y
0.65	25.6	Y	28.0	Y
0.60	24.1	Y	26.4	Y
0.55	21.3	N	24.8	Y

NOTES:

X_0 denotes the hydrogen content established as a result of the rotation induced mixing at the end of the mass transfer; M_{opt} denotes the present mass of the optical component for the models corresponding to C-N+09 and O+11 solutions, respectively; Y denotes acceptable and N non-acceptable models from the evolutionary point of view - see the text

hydrogen depleted due to earlier evolution of the mass donor were mixed and homogenized. As a result, the hydrogen content of the outer layers of HDE 226868 might be now lower that normal for the Population I star ($X = 0.7$). For the more extensive discussion of the role of mass-transfer, rotation and mixing in the binary stars evolution the reader is referred to de Mink et al. (2013).

The present rotation of HDE 226868 ($v \sin i \approx 100$ km/s, C-N+09) is not very fast for an O type star. Such rotation does not influence significantly the stellar structure. However, fast rotation in the past could leave a permanent imprint in the form of the lowered hydrogen content of the star. This would have significant evolutionary consequences. It is difficult to estimate quantitatively the amount of the accreted matter, its chemical composition and the efficiency of the mixing. However, the overall effect may be, very roughly, judged by parameterizing it with the initial (i.e. after the mass transfer) hydrogen content in HDE 226868. This is a very crude approach, but it may give an idea about the role of the processes mentioned above.

For this reason, I calculated the evolutionary tracks for stars with the initial hydrogen content equal $X_0 = 0.65$, 0.60 and 0.55. The way of fitting the tracks was the same as for models described in section 2.2 (I required that the luminosity, effective temperature and the flux of the stellar wind will match the observed values). The tracks were fitted to both solutions: C-N+09 and O+11. The resulting tracks are shown in Fig. 3 (the tracks for $X_0 = 0.70$ are added for the comparison). The resulting values of the present mass of HDE 226868 are listed in Tab. 3. As might be expected, this mass decreases with the decreasing hydrogen content. This reflects the well known fact that hydrogen depleted models are more luminous and it is possible to match the observed luminosity for the smaller mass. The smallest value of the present mass (21.3 $M_\odot$) is obtained for $X_0 = 0.55$ fitted to C-N+09 solution. This value would agree (within the existing uncertainties) with the estimate of O+11. However, this model is not realistic, as it represents the star which is in very fast post-main sequence phase of evolution (shell hydrogen burning phase – see Fig. 3d). This model is increasing its radius at a rate of 1 % in 50 years.

Such rapid increase would have consequences for the flux of the stellar wind (increase), the X-ray luminosity (increase) and the orbital period of the system (change depends on the model of the wind). None of these changes is seen during the forty years of observations of HDE 226868, indicating that the star is in slow, nuclear phase of its evolution. Therefore, we have to label this solution with a letter N (model non-acceptable from the evolutionary point of view) in Tab. 3. If we consider only models that are acceptable (those labeled with Y in Tab. 3), then the smallest value of the present mass of HDE 226868 is equal to 24.1 $M_\odot$. This is not much smaller than the value 27.2 $M_\odot$ selected in the earlier discussion.

5 CONCLUSIONS

(1) The present mass of HDE 226868 is, most likely, in the range 25 to 35 $M_\odot$ (estimate based on the evolutionary models). The most likely value is 27 $M_\odot$ (corresponding to the central values of R+11 distance and C-N+09 effective temperature).

(2) The mass of Cyg X−1 (the black hole) is, probably, in the range 13 to 23 $M_\odot$. The most likely value is perhaps 16 $M_\odot$ (corresponding to the mass of the optical component M_{opt} equal 27 $M_\odot$, a Roche lobe filling factor f_{RL} equal 0.965 and an inclination i equal 30^o).

(3) The value of the present mass of HDE 226868 as low as suggested by O+11 (19 ± 2 $M_\odot$) is incorrect since it violates the mass-luminosity relation for the the massive core hydrogen burning stars (this relation was not incorporated in the iterative process of O+11).

(4) There are observational indications that the hydrogen content of HDE 226868 ($X \sim 0.55$) might be lower than normal for a population I star. This might be a result of the mass transfer, the resulting fast rotation and the rotation induced mixing of the mass gainer.

If this is confirmed (i.e. HDE 226868 has lowered hydrogen content), then, according to my models, its present mass might be somewhat lower ($\sim$ 24 $M_\odot$). However, it cannot be much lower



Figure 3. The evolutionary tracks in the H-R diagram for the different initial hydrogen content: (a) $X_0 = 0.70$, (b) $X_0 = 0.65$, (c) $X_0 = 0.60$ and (d) $X_0 = 0.55$. The tracks are labeled with the initial mass of the star (in solar units). Other symbols are the same as in Fig. 2. The second wiggle in each evolutionary track (change of the direction of the evolution from left to right) marks the end of the core hydrogen burning and the beginning of the fast evolutionary phase.

(again according to my models) if we require that the model corresponds to the long-lasting evolutionary phase. If the lower hydrogen content of HDE 226868 is confirmed, then a more detailed binary model incorporating the effects of mass transfer and rotational mixing will be desirable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank A. Zdziarski for a careful reading of the manuscript and for helpful comments. I would like also to thank the anonymous referee for calling my attention to the necessity of considering rotation as an important factor in the evolution of the optical component. This work was partially supported by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education grant N203 581240 and by the Polish National Science Center project 2012/04/M/ST9/00780.

REFERENCES

Bolton C.T., 1972, Nature, 235, 271
Caballero-Nieves S.M. et al., 2009, ApJ, 701, 1895 (C-N+09)
de Mink, S.E., Langer, N., Izzard, R.G.. Sana, H., de Koter, A., 2013, ApJ, 764, 166
Gies D.R., Bolton, C.T., 1982, ApJ, 260, 240
Gies D.R., Bolton C.T., 1986a, ApJ, 304, 371
Gies D.R., Bolton, C.T., 1986b, ApJ, 304, 389
Gies D.R. et al., 2003, ApJ, 583, 424
Gies D.R. et al., 2008, ApJ, 678, 1237
Gratton, R.G., Carretta, E., Bragaglia, A., 2012, A&ARv, 20, 50
Hurley J.R., Pols O.R., Tout, C.A., 2000, MNRAS, 315, 543 (HPT)
King, I.R. et al., 2012, AJ, 144, 5
Nieuwenhuijzen H., de Jager C., 1990, A&A, 231, 134
Orosz J.A., McClintock J.E., Aufdenberg J.P., Remillard R.A., Reid M.J., Narayan R., Gou L., 2011, ApJ, 742, 84 (O+11)
Reid M.J., McClintock J.E., Narayan R., Gou L., Remillard R.A., Orosz J.A., 2011, ApJ, 742, 83 (R+11)
Wilms, J., Nowak, M.A., Pottschmidt, K., Pooley, G.G., Fritz, S., 2006, A&A, 447, 245
Zdziarski, A.A., Skinner, G.K., Pooley, G.G., Lubiński, P., 2011, MNRAS, 416, 1324
Ziółkowski J., 2005, MNRAS, 358, 851